

REMARKS

Applicants wish to acknowledge Examiner Nguyen for entering the Amendment filed on December 16, 2002, in which Claims 3 and 8-17 were canceled. In view of the amendment provided herein, Claims 20-23 are pending in the present application.

Claim 20 corresponds to previously pending Claim 1 with a further recitation of the embodiments of the metal wire. Claim 21 corresponds to previously pending Claim 18. Claim 22 corresponds to previously pending Claim 6 with a further recitation of the embodiments of the metal wire. Claim 22 corresponds to previously pending Claim 19.

As stated in the Amendment filed on December 16, 2002, the claims as currently pending focus on the embodiments of the dependent claims by adding the limitations of dependent claims to the independent claims. In this regard the several anticipation rejections are no longer applicable (i.e., Takahashi and Wright), as they did not apply against, e.g., any of Claims 9, 11, 12, 13, 14 or 15, which were previously added to independent Claims 1 and 6. In addition, because Claims 13 and 14 have been incorporated into the two independent claims, the obviousness rejection over Takahashi alone is no longer applicable.

With respect to the rejection of original Claims 13-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103 over the combined disclosures of Takahashi and Yoshikawa, Applicants respectfully submit that this ground of rejection is obviated by the present amendment.

Citing *In re Royka*, MPEP §2143.03 states: “to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.” Applicants submit that this combination of disclosures fails to present even a *prima facie* case of obviousness against the pending claims.

Specifically, the combined disclosures of the applied references, even when combined, fail to disclose or suggest a heat treated adhesive layer on the metal wire, wherein

the metal wire is either a brass wire and a brass-plated steel wire. Moreover, neither Takahashi nor Yoshikawa discuss, disclose or suggest, either individually or combined, a heat-treated adhesive layer comprising a chlorinated rubber and a chlorosulfonated polyethylene rubber. This adhesive layer is described, for example, at specification page 5, lines 9-19. This material similarly is used in Examples 1-4, and shows excellent results (note Table 1 at specification page 9).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this ground of rejection.

Applicants submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance.

Early notification of such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Norman F. Oblon  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 24,618

Richard L. Treanor, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 36,379



**22850**

Tel.: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413-2220  
RLT\VKS  
E:\198224US-RCE amend.wpd

Docket No.: 198224US0X  
Serial No.: 09/680,401



RECEIVED  
FEB 24 2003  
TC 1700

MARKED-UP COPY

IN THE CLAIMS

Cancel Claims 1, 4-6, and 18-19

20.-23. (New)